

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 19, 21, 26, and 28. The Examiner has objected to claims 2-9, 12-17, 20, 22-25, 27, and 29-33. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-33.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, stating "...drawing elements in Fig. 1-4 need descriptive labels and misspellings in Fig. 5 need correction." Specifically, with respect to Figs. 1-4, the Examiner states, "In Fig. 1-4, Examiner suggests spelling out abbreviation not obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, such as DS, SI, and TI, but obviously important to the invention, in order to increase legibility." Applicant submits the scope of the invention is defined by the claims; thus what is important to the invention should be determined accordingly. Moreover, Applicant notes the designations used in the drawings are consistent with the specification and can be readily understood in the context of the present application. However, pursuant to the Examiner's specific request, to increase legibility, Applicant has amended Figs. 1-4 to spell out abbreviations. Applicant submits such amendment is merely cosmetic and does not affect the scope of the claims. With respect to Fig. 5, the Examiner states, "In Fig. 5, value is misspelled in 509, 510, and 511." Pursuant to the Examiner's specific request, to correct misspellings, Applicant has amended Fig. 5. Applicant submits such amendment is merely cosmetic and does not affect the scope of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been obviated.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure, stating "On p. 4, Examiner suggests adding the word 'present' before invention in Fig. 3, in consistent with descriptions of Fig. 1, 2, 4." Pursuant to the Examiner's specific request, to increase consistency among the descriptions of the figures, Applicant has amended the brief description of Fig. 3 on page 4. Applicant submits such amendment is merely cosmetic and does not affect the scope of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits the Examiner's objection to the disclosure has been obviated.

Applicant has further amended the specification to correct a typographical error on page 5, line 27. Applicant submits such amendment is merely cosmetic and does not affect the scope of the claims.

While the Examiner states, "Claim 5 is objected to...", Applicant notes the Examiner then refers to "cl. 19." Thus, Applicant understand the Examiner to have objected to claim 19. The Examiner states, "With regard to cl. 19, Examiner suggest replacing – operably – with "operatively" in

In. 5." While the Examiner suggests replacing "operably" with –operatively–, Applicant notes the Examiner does not provide a rationale for such proposed amendment. Applicant submits claim 19 is allowable without such amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 19, 21, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Matthews et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,584,122). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant submits the "(output port interface, col. 20, ln. 25)" fails to disclose "a plurality of transport interfaces." Thus, Applicant submits claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 10. For example, Applicant submits the "(output port interface, col. 20, ln. 25)" fails to disclose "transport interfaces." Thus, Applicant submits claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 11. The Examiner alleges "Matthews further discloses routing packets according to destination addresses 172 (one byte destination address in Fig. 7, col. 20, ln. 8) associated with the packets (Fig. 7 is a switch packet format)." Applicant submits the Examiner's assertion underscores Applicant's arguments with respect to the allowability of claim 10. Thus, Applicant submits claim 11 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 18, Applicant submits the cited portion of the cited reference fails to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 18. The Examiner alleges "Matthews further discloses each of the transport interfaces is associated with exactly one of the classes of service (each queue to a buffer to an output) ('...The switch packet is placed on the appropriate queue for the appropriate port....The packet is read from the queue into an outbound rate-matching FIFO buffer 405, and output 406....," col. 20, ln. 1-25)." For example, Applicant notes the Examiner has identified the "transport interfaces" as allegedly being taught by "(output port interface, col. 20, ln. 25)." Now, the Examiner alleges the cited reference teaching "(each queue to a buffer to an output)." However, Applicant notes the cited

reference states, in col. 20, lines 23-25, "...the queue reading and output FIFO buffering step 405 and output step 406 are performed by an output port interface." Thus, Applicant submits claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 19, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 19. For example, Applicant submits "(output port interface, col. 20, ln. 25)" fails to disclose "transport interfaces operably coupled to the service interface, the transport interfaces carrying subsets of the data packets wherein the classes of service of the subsets of the data packets carried by the transport interfaces are unique to each of the transport interfaces." Thus, Applicant submits claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 21, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 21. For example, Applicant notes the cited reference states, in col. 20, lines 7-11, "The switch packet format of FIG. 7 includes the one byte destination address 172. A look-up is performed on the packet by a lookup unit 403 to determine on which outbound port the packet is to be transmitted." Thus, Applicant submits claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 26, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 26. For example, Applicant notes the Examiner identifies the "transport interfaces" as allegedly being taught by "(output port interface, col. 20, ln. 25)." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Now, the Examiner alleges the cited reference teaching "(each queue to a buffer to an output)." However, Applicant notes the cited reference states, in col. 20, lines 23-25, "...the queue reading and output FIFO buffering step 405 and output step 406 are performed by an output port interface." Thus, Applicant submits claim 26 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 28, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose the subject matter recited in claim 28. For example, Applicant notes claim 28 depends from claim 26. Applicant submits the supposed teaching of mapping in the cited reference alleged by the Examiner is inconsistent with the Examiner's teachings alleged by the Examiner with respect to claim 26. Thus, Applicant submits claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner states claims 2-9, 12-17, 20, 22-25, 27, and 29-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but states they would be allowable if rewritten in independent

form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of the claims from which the objected claims depend. Thus, Applicant submits claims 2-9, 12-17, 20, 22-25, 27, and 29-33 are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

08/08/2006



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
PO Box 164075
Austin, Texas 78716-4075
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)